

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspio.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F.	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/080,909 05/19/1998		05/19/1998	GEORGE ISHIKAWA	1075.1013-CC	9908	
21171	7590	08/30/2002				
STAAS &	HALSEY	/ LLP	EXAMINER			
700 11TH S SUITE 500			MOSKOWITZ, NELSON			
WASHING	ION, DC	20001		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				3663		
				DATE MAILED: 08/30/2002		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

			D
	Applicati n No.	Applicant(s)	
. Advisory Action	09/080,909	ISHIKAWA ET AL.	
,	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nelson Moskowitz	3663	
Th MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 12 August 2002 FAILS TO PLACE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this appliced to the control of	cation. A proper reply to a chiplaces the application in	
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The da have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extending CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moderned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the	fee. The appropriate extension fee und the final Office action; or (2) as set forth	er in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:		
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require furth-	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) \square they raise the issue of new matter (see Note t	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying	the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s): <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendme	nt
 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ req place the application in condition for allow 6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection. 	ance because: See Continuation	Sheet.	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	(s) a)□ will not be entered or bould be rejected is provided belo) will be entered and an ow or appended.	
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. \square The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapp	proved by the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). ;	<u>14</u> .	
10.⊠ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>		11) 11/1 / C	\mathcal{A}
	NELSON MOSKOWITZ / PRIMARY EXAMINER	Nelson Moskowitz Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3663	ノ





Continuation of 3. Applicant's r ply has overcome the following rejection(s): the obvious type double patenting rejection presented in section 5 of the last Office action has been overcome by the Terminal Disclaimer.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The breadth of the claim language "a multi-stag optical amplifier" includes the plural stage amplifier of Fig. 14 of Antos wherein OFA-2 precedes the dispersion compensation fiber (DCF), and OFA-3 follows the DCF. The claim language does not require the amplifiers to be in a single enclosure as argued. Note tha Antos discloses (col. 17, lines 26-28) that all three amplifiers are used together to overcome the losses introduced by the DCF. Applicants' arguments based upon pages 103-106 of the disclosure appear to be in error as the specification contains only 102 pages.

Continuation of 10. Other: The Auge et al reference has been considered and found cumulative to the references of record...